

1  
2  
3

4 E-FILED on 12/18/09  
5  
6  
7

8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10 SAN JOSE DIVISION

11  
12 THE CENTRAL INSTITUTE FOR  
13 EXPERIMENTAL ANIMALS, a Japanese  
corporation,

14 Plaintiff,

15 v.

16 THE JACKSON LABORATORY, a Maine  
corporation,

17 Defendant.

18 No. C-08-05568 RMW

19 ORDER DENYING CIEA'S MOTION TO  
20 POSTPONE THE TUTORIAL AND CLAIM  
21 CONSTRUCTION HEARING

22 [Re Docket No. 123]

23 Plaintiff, the Central Institute for Experimental Animals ("CIEA"), moves to change the date  
24 for the tutorial and claim construction hearing, currently scheduled for January 26, 2010 and January  
25 27, 2010, to the earliest possible date in March. CIEA seeks this postponement because its expert,  
26 Dr. Raif Geha, requires back surgery on January 19, 2010 and therefore is not able to present a  
tutorial the following week. Defendant, the Jackson Laboratory ("Jackson"), opposes the motion  
and seeks to preclude CIEA from introducing an expert witness for either the tutorial or the claim  
construction hearing because CIEA did not timely disclose its expert witness as required by the  
Patent Local Rules.

27  
28  
ORDER DENYING CIEA'S MOTION TO POSTPONE THE TUTORIAL AND CLAIM CONSTRUCTION HEARING—No.  
C-08-05568 RMW  
CCL

1 Patent Local Rule 4-2(b) requires designating the testimony of expert witnesses that will be  
2 used in support of claim construction and providing "a description of the substance of that witness'  
3 proposed testimony that includes a listing of any opinions to be rendered in connection with claim  
4 construction." Likewise, Patent Local Rule 4-3(e) provides: "Whether any party proposes to call  
5 one or more witnesses at the Claim Construction Hearing, the identity of each such witness, and for  
6 each witness, a summary of his or her testimony including, for each expert, each opinion to be  
7 offered related to claim construction." CIEA's Patent L.R. 4-2 preliminary claim construction  
8 disclosure did not identify an expert witness for claim construction or for the tutorial. Ex. A to D.I.  
9 126. The parties' Patent L.R. 4-3 joint claim construction and prehearing statement also did not  
10 include any disclosure of an expert witness for claim construction or for the tutorial by CIEA. D.I.  
11 69.

12 CIEA contends that it was not required to disclose Dr. Geha as an expert witness because it  
13 seeks only to have him present a tutorial, not to testify regarding claim construction. If Dr. Geha's  
14 only purpose is to educate the court regarding basic, undisputed technical issues as CIEA contends,  
15 he might have been a helpful teacher for a tutorial. However, the nature of any tutorial has to be  
16 agreed upon by the parties or worked out with the court. Moreover, pursuant to the case  
17 management conference on June 5, 2009, the court understood that the structure for any tutorial  
18 would be by the agreement of the parties and not by the unilateral action of either party choosing its  
19 own method of presenting the tutorial. CIEA's unilateral decision to have an undisclosed expert  
20 present its portion of the tutorial would appear to be more akin to an offer of expert testimony rather  
21 than the joint presentation of agreed upon background information. As discussed above, CIEA has  
22 failed to meet the expert witness disclosure requirements in the Patent Local Rules, and therefore it  
23 is precluded from offering expert witness testimony in relation to the claim construction hearing  
24 except as may be agreed by the parties for a tutorial. The court does anticipate the parties will  
25 present a tutorial but the method of presentation and content must be agreed upon by the parties.

26 For the foregoing reasons, the court denies CIEA's motion to postpone the tutorial and claim  
27 construction hearing. In addition, CIEA may not call an expert witness at the claim construction  
28

**United States District Court**  
For the Northern District of California

1 hearing because no expert was disclosed. The parties are free, however, to agree upon the use of an  
2 expert or experts for a tutorial.

3

4

5 DATED: 12/18/09

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

*Ronald M Whyte*

RONALD M. WHYTE  
United States District Judge

1 | Notice of this document has been electronically sent to:

**2 || Counsel for Plaintiff:**

3 Joseph Diamante JDiamante@stroock.com  
Kenneth E. Keller kkeller@kksrr.com  
4 Michael David Lisi mlisi@kksrr.com  
Ronald Marc Daignault rdaignault@stroock.com

## **Counsel for Defendant:**

7 Chelsea A Loughran cloughran@wolfgreenfield.com  
Howard Alan Slavitt EfilingHAS@cpdb.com  
Michael A. Albert malbert@wolfgreenfield.com  
8 Michael Rader mrader@wolfgreenfield.com  
Allison Lee Ehlert ale@cpdb.com

10 Counsel are responsible for distributing copies of this document to co-counsel that have not  
registered for e-filing under the court's CM/ECF program.

**Dated:** 12/18/09

CCL  
**Chambers of Judge Whyte**